



09:23:47 1 would be a very hands-on corporate strategy group.

09:23:55 2 Q. And could you elaborate what you mean by People

09:23:57 3 Operations.

09:24:02 4 A. The People Operations group is a name that I

09:24:06 5 chose because it -- primarily because the group was

09:24:13 6 inclusive of human resources but broader than that.

09:24:17 7 The focus was what you might call administrative G&A

09:24:21 8 pieces so, for example, the chefs all used to work for

09:24:24 9 me. We had quite a few of them. But it was inclusive

09:24:28 10 of all of the traditional aspects of human resources,

09:24:32 11 some parts that you might include in facilities, some

09:24:36 12 parts you might include in finance.

09:24:39 13 Q. And you mentioned GMA. What does that stand

09:24:44 14 for?

09:24:44 15 A. G&A, sorry. Functionally G&A, I guess it's

09:24:49 16 general and administrative.

09:24:52 17 Q. Oh.

09:24:53 18 MR. RUBIN: G&A.

09:24:56 19 THE WITNESS: Yeah. Sorry. Ampersand.

09:25:00 20 MR. HARVEY: Q. Okay. In your role as vice

09:25:01 21 president of business operations, you oversaw Google's

09:25:06 22 recruiting, correct?

09:25:10 23 A. Yes. Recruiting was a -- was part of my

09:25:13 24 group's mandate, and I would have had somebody -- I

09:25:19 25 would have had somebody running recruiting, though I do

09:25:23 1 not recall at that time who it was to be honest.

09:25:25 2 Q. Is that the role Mr. Geshuri eventually

09:25:28 3 occupied?

09:25:28 4 A. At one point in time, Mr. Geshuri was running a

09:25:32 5 good chunk of recruiting.

09:25:42 6 Q. Was compensation part of your purview?

09:25:44 7 A. Yes. Compensation was also part of that People

09:25:47 8 Operations group's purview.

09:25:50 9 Q. And so you had responsibility to design and

09:25:56 10 supervise a -- pardon me, supervise compensation at

09:26:00 11 Google company wide, correct?

09:26:03 12 A. I would say that that's a fair description,

09:26:04 13 that the purview included design and monitoring and

09:26:09 14 oversight for compensation programs across the company.

09:26:12 15 Yes.

09:26:16 16 Q. And these responsibilities -- and these

09:26:23 17 responsibilities, as you've described them, did you keep

09:26:30 18 that -- those responsibilities until you moved to head

09:26:37 19 Google.org?

09:26:41 20 A. No. I did not keep the responsibilities for

09:26:44 21 that entire period of time. At a point, I actually

09:26:50 22 transitioned all of the People Operations group under

09:26:55 23 the responsibility of Laszlo Bock who did report to me.

09:27:00 24 And then at a point in time, I moved Laszlo from

09:27:04 25 reporting to me up to reporting to Eric so that I was no

09:27:07 1 longer operationally responsible for that group. That  
09:27:14 2 happened prior to me moving to my responsibilities with  
09:27:17 3 Google.org so I continued on in my responsibilities with  
09:27:22 4 business operations while not having any direct  
09:27:24 5 oversight over People Operations.

09:27:27 6 Q. What I'm trying to pinpoint is when those moves  
09:27:31 7 happened. So starting in I believe you said August of  
09:27:35 8 2003, you had this wider set of responsibilities  
09:27:37 9 reporting directly to Eric Schmidt.

09:27:41 10 When did you move what you described as People  
09:27:46 11 Operations to Laszlo Bock?

09:27:48 12 A. I don't actually recall specifically when  
09:27:53 13 Laszlo moved from reporting to me to reporting to Eric.

09:27:58 14 Q. But when did Laszlo Bock enter the picture so  
09:28:01 15 that he took over some of those responsibilities but  
09:28:03 16 reported to you?

09:28:06 17 A. I don't recall when we hired Laszlo, but I  
09:28:09 18 hired Laszlo to come in and work for me. And I gave him  
09:28:13 19 a set of responsibilities in People Operations. I don't  
09:28:17 20 recall if I gave him all of the pieces when he first  
09:28:21 21 joined or not, actually.

09:28:24 22 Ultimately, I gave him all of the pieces of  
09:28:26 23 People Operations, rolling up to him, reporting to me  
09:28:31 24 and then at some point in time, I transitioned him to  
09:28:34 25 report directly to Eric Schmidt.

10:03:18 1 MR. HARVEY: What kind of break do you want to  
10:03:19 2 take?  
10:03:20 3 MR. RUBIN: Ten minutes.  
10:03:20 4 MR. HARVEY: That's fine.  
10:03:21 5 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 10:03 a.m.  
10:03:23 6 We're going off the record. Sorry. This is end of  
10:03:29 7 video No. 1.  
10:03:30 8 Off the record.  
10:03:33 9 (Recess taken.)  
10:07:30 10 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This is the beginning of  
10:18:48 11 video No. 2 in the deposition of Shona Brown. The time  
10:18:50 12 is 10:18 a.m.  
10:18:52 13 We're back on the record.  
10:18:56 14 MR. HARVEY: Q. I believe you mentioned  
10:18:57 15 earlier that Google recruited people, correct?  
10:19:03 16 A. Yes. Google recruited people.  
10:19:06 17 Q. And during your time at Google, Google grew at  
10:19:10 18 a rapid pace, correct?  
10:19:11 19 MR. RUBIN: Objection. Vague.  
10:19:17 20 THE WITNESS: Google grew significantly as an  
10:19:19 21 organization from the time that I joined through the  
10:19:21 22 period in question. Yes.  
10:19:24 23 MR. HARVEY: Q. And -- well, why don't I  
10:19:28 24 do this with more specificity. Give me one moment.  
10:19:56 25 I'm going to show you what has been marked as

10:19:59 1 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 634. If you could take a look at  
10:20:03 2 that and let me know when you're ready.  
10:20:07 3 (Whereupon, Exhibit 634 was marked for  
10:20:07 4 identification.)  
10:20:44 5 THE WITNESS: Okay. I'm ready.

Redacted

# Redacted

10:21:55 2 Q. Sure.

10:21:55 3 And Google experienced growth in the different

10:21:58 4 categories of employees described in this document,

10:22:00 5 correct?

10:22:01 6 MR. RUBIN: Objection. Vague.

10:22:06 7 THE WITNESS: We could go through each of the

10:22:08 8 different functions line by line. And I didn't actually

10:22:14 9 look to look quickly. But if I take engineering, for

10:22:18 10 example -- well, it's unclear from this data, actually,

10:22:25 11 to be honest, how many employees you're growing and in

10:22:29 12 each of the different, because it's all in percentiles

10:22:34 13 based. So we would have to debunk that into absolutes

10:22:38 14 to be clear but....

10:22:38 15 MR. HARVEY: Q. Sure.

10:22:38 16 A. I agree with you in the aggregate the

10:22:40 17 organization is getting bigger. I can't tell you

10:22:42 18 exactly from this precisely which function is growing,

10:22:46 19 quote/unquote, rapidly.

10:22:50 20 Q. Drawing on your own personal experience, you

10:22:52 21 know --

10:22:53 22 A. Yes.

10:22:53 23 Q. -- regardless --

10:22:53 24 A. Yes.

10:22:53 25 Q. -- of what this says here --

10:22:55 1 A. Yes.

10:22:57 2 Q. -- Google recruited for employees for a variety

10:23:00 3 of different titles and job responsibilities, correct?

10:23:04 4 A. We had a large -- we were growing a diverse

10:23:09 5 operating company, I would say unlike if you were, for

10:23:12 6 example, hiring into a law firm where you are typically

10:23:16 7 bringing in people in very similar roles and similar

10:23:19 8 levels, so the number of different roles you're

10:23:21 9 recruiting for is quite small.

10:23:22 10 In contrast, in an operating company when

10:23:24 11 you're building it and as you get bigger, that grows.

10:23:28 12 You have a wide variety of roles that you're hiring for.

10:23:32 13 Yes.

10:23:34 14 Q. Okay. And why don't we focus on the recruiting

10:23:37 15 part of that hiring for a moment.

10:23:39 16 A. Sorry, what do you mean by the recruiting part

10:23:40 17 of hiring? I don't actually know.

10:23:43 18 Q. Is that because, to you, hiring is part of

10:23:45 19 recruiting?

10:23:47 20 MR. RUBIN: I think she's just asking you for a

10:23:49 21 clarification.

10:23:50 22 THE WITNESS: Can you just clarify what you

10:23:51 23 mean by recruiting.

10:23:53 24 MR. RUBIN: She's just asking you to clarify

10:23:54 25 your question.

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

Redacted

# Redacted

10:48:52 20 Q. Are you familiar with the term internal equity?

10:48:57 21 A. No. It's not really a term that I typically

10:48:59 22 use.

10:48:59 23 Can you explain what you mean.

10:49:02 24 Q. So your testimony is that you've never heard

10:49:04 25 the term?

10:49:05 1 MR. RUBIN: Objection. Mischaracterizes her  
10:49:07 2 testimony.

10:49:09 3 THE WITNESS: I said that it's not a term that  
10:49:11 4 I typically use. I don't recall its usage in parlance  
10:49:17 5 so I'm not exactly sure what -- it could mean a variety  
10:49:20 6 of things.

10:49:21 7 MR. HARVEY: Okay.

10:49:32 8 (Discussion off the record.)

10:49:41 9 MR. HARVEY: Q. I'm going to hand you  
10:49:45 10 what's been marked Plaintiffs' Exhibit 564.

10:49:48 11 (Whereupon, Exhibit 564 was marked for  
10:49:48 12 identification.)

10:50:01 13 MR. HARVEY: Q. Just let me know when  
10:50:01 14 you're ready.

10:50:02 15 I'll just say that my questions are going to  
10:50:04 16 be focused on Sheryl Sandberg's email of April 3rd on  
10:50:09 17 the second page and your response.

10:52:31 18 A. Okay. I get the gist of it. Depending on your  
10:52:33 19 question, I may have to read more. It's fairly lengthy.

10:52:38 20 Q. Sure. Sure. I appreciate that.

10:52:38 21 Why don't we start with the bottom of page 1.

10:52:41 22 A. Bottom of page 1. Yes.

10:52:48 23 Q. First, did you, in fact, send this email to  
10:52:52 24 Sheryl Sandberg and others on April 3rd, 2004?

10:52:56 25 A. I have no recollection of this email, but I

Redacted

# Redacted

**Redacted**

10:59:45 15 MR. HARVEY: Q. It's individual, but it's part  
10:59:47 16 of this company-wide system where you're trying to  
10:59:50 17 maintain fairness in light of what you were discussing,  
10:59:53 18 the external market facts, the internal market facts,  
10:59:56 19 correct?  
10:59:56 20 MR. RUBIN: Objection. Mischaracterizes  
10:59:58 21 prior --  
10:59:59 22 THE WITNESS: Sorry.  
10:59:59 23 MR. RUBIN: -- lengthy description.  
11:00:01 24 THE WITNESS: Could you just clarify your  
11:00:02 25 question in there.

# Redacted

11:00:22 7 MR. RUBIN: Objection. Vague. Ambiguous.  
11:00:24 8 Mischaracterizes prior testimony.

# Redacted

11:00:58 20 MR. HARVEY: Q. Okay. Thanks.  
11:01:00 21 Could you explain how those bands of pay, say  
11:01:02 22 for any given job ladder, what was their relationship to  
11:01:07 23 each other? So for example, you know, comparing the  
11:01:11 24 lower rungs, if I can put it that way, on the job ladder  
11:01:14 25 to the higher rungs.

11:01:17 1 MR. RUBIN: Objection. Ambiguous.

11:01:22 2 THE WITNESS: If your question is about the

11:01:24 3 size of the, you know, percent changes between the rungs

11:01:30 4 on a ladder or the ratios, I actually -- I'm the wrong

11:01:33 5 person to ask. I don't remember those level of detail.

11:01:35 6 MR. HARVEY: Q. Who would be the right person

11:01:36 7 to ask?

11:01:39 8 A. I'd have to speculate to decide at which level

11:01:46 9 of the organization individuals would remember that. So

11:01:52 10 I -- I mean....

11:01:54 11 Q. Well --

11:01:56 12 A. Of course I was exposed to it over time, but

11:01:58 13 this is some time ago and I don't remember the

11:01:59 14 specifics.

Redacted

**Redacted**

11:03:18 2 Q. Did those methods change during your time at  
11:03:23 3 Google?

11:03:24 4 A. Yes. Over the period of time in question, the  
11:03:28 5 methods changed in terms of how we attempted to evaluate  
11:03:31 6 our employees.

11:03:32 7 Q. Why don't we go through it.

11:03:34 8 So starting in 2003, what was Google's method  
11:03:40 9 for evaluating performance of its employees?

11:03:43 10 MR. RUBIN: Objection. Vague.

11:03:47 11 THE WITNESS: Is it possible for you to ask me  
11:03:49 12 a more specific aspect of evaluation that you're  
11:03:53 13 interested in?

11:03:54 14 MR. HARVEY: Q. Well, as it relates to  
11:03:55 15 making decisions about compensation.

11:04:00 16 MR. RUBIN: Same objection.

11:04:09 17 THE WITNESS: I'm struggling to answer your  
11:04:10 18 question when we had, you know, such a vast array of  
11:04:16 19 relevant elements, it seems to me.

11:04:18 20 Is there some particular part of how we  
11:04:21 21 evaluated people that you're interested in that I could  
11:04:24 22 address?

11:04:25 23 MR. HARVEY: Q. Yeah, why don't we get  
11:04:27 24 more specific.

**Redacted**

# Redacted

11:06:20 1

MR. RUBIN: Objection. Vague.

Redacted

# Redacted

11:10:03 1 MR. RUBIN: Ambiguous as to time.

11:10:07 2 MR. HARVEY: Q. From when you started

11:10:09 3 until the present time, to your knowledge.

Redacted

11:12:08 23 Q. Maybe I'm not being clear. I'm not asking

11:12:10 24 about the relationship between budgets and compensation

11:12:14 25 decisions or timing or any of that. I'm just asking a

11:24:31 1 Q. Okay. Have you ever discussed or thought about  
11:24:42 2 whether, you know, Googlers choose to work for Google  
11:24:46 3 for reasons other than money or benefits?  
11:24:50 4 MR. RUBIN: Objection. Overly broad. Calls  
11:24:53 5 for speculation.

Redacted

# Redacted

11:26:32 5 MR. HARVEY: Thank you.

11:27:06 6 Q. Please take a look at what's been marked

11:27:08 7 Plaintiffs' Exhibit 551.

11:27:09 8 (Whereupon, Exhibit 551 was marked for

11:27:09 9 identification.)

11:28:17 10 THE WITNESS: Okay.

11:28:18 11 MR. HARVEY: Q. I just want to get into

11:28:19 12 some of the vocabulary here and just walk through

11:28:22 13 the email.

11:28:23 14 Well, first I want to ask, who is Jeffrey

11:28:27 15 Donovan?

11:28:31 16 A. My recollection is that Jeffrey was one of

11:28:38 17 the -- was in our law group somewhere. I don't recall

11:28:42 18 that he was part of the people ops organization.

11:28:58 19 Q. Okay. Did he, in fact, send you this email --

11:29:00 20 I guess you were cc'd -- on January 19th, 2004?

11:29:05 21 A. I don't have any recollection of this email,

11:29:07 22 but I have no reason to believe that I wasn't cc'd on it

11:29:11 23 as this exhibit suggests.

# Redacted

# Redacted

11:29:49 7 Q. And just for clarity, I won't ask you to get  
11:29:52 8 into Mr. Donovan's mind. I'm just using this as a way  
11:29:55 9 to get your understanding of what different terms mean.  
11:30:00 10 So what did -- well, how did Google level its  
11:30:07 11 employees?  
11:30:07 12 MR. RUBIN: How did Google -- I'm sorry?  
11:30:09 13 MR. HARVEY: It's not put very artfully.

# Redacted

# Redacted

Redacted

# Redacted

11:35:13 11 MR. RUBIN: Dean --

11:35:13 12 MR. HARVEY: Yep.

11:35:13 13 MR. RUBIN: -- I think it's a good time for a

11:35:15 14 break and I actually have to go to the restroom.

11:35:17 15 MR. HARVEY: Well, I have no objection to that,

11:35:18 16 so....

11:35:19 17 MR. RUBIN: Okay. Good.

11:35:19 18 MR. HARVEY: All right.

11:35:20 19 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 11:35 a.m.

11:35:25 20 We're going off the record. This is the end of video

11:35:29 21 No. 2.

11:35:35 22 (Recess taken.)

11:50:12 23 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This is the beginning of

11:50:14 24 video No. 3 in the deposition of Shona Brown. The time

11:50:17 25 is 11:50 a.m.

# Redacted

Redacted

# Redacted

05:14:51 11 MR. HARVEY: Q. If you could please take a

05:14:53 12 look at Exhibit 625.

05:15:00 13 (Whereupon, Exhibit 625 was marked for

05:15:00 14 identification.)

05:15:14 15 MR. HARVEY: Q. And I'm only going to ask

05:15:15 16 you about Jonathan Rosenberg's email towards the top

05:15:20 17 and your response.

05:15:24 18 A. Jonathan Rosenberg's -- oh, wait. Sorry. I

05:15:26 19 just want to see what's up.

05:15:34 20 Q. Sure.

05:16:25 21 A. Okay.

05:16:27 22 Q. Did you write this email to the OC -- I'm

05:16:29 23 sorry -- to Jonathan Rosenberg copying the OC and Bill

05:16:33 24 Campbell on October 9th, 2010?

05:16:37 25 A. Yes. I don't recall the email, but it looks to

05:16:39 1 be an email from me to Jonathan in October 2010. Yes.

Redacted

# Redacted

Redacted

# Redacted

# Redacted

# Redacted

06:03:43 16                   MR. HARVEY: I think that's the end of my  
06:03:48 17                   questions on the current documentary record.

06:03:50 18                   Unless you have any questions?

06:03:52 19                   MR. RUBIN: We don't have any questions.

06:03:53 20                   So as I said in my letter to you on I think the

06:03:57 21                   25th, either when your questions end or when seven hours

06:04:01 22                   end, the deposition's closed, we know that there's a

06:04:03 23                   pending motion to compel. And as we said, although the

06:04:07 24                   deposition is closed, if you are successful in that

06:04:09 25                   motion and you come to us with particular documents that

06:04:11 1 you think it's imperative for you to be able to ask  
06:04:17 2 Ms. Brown additional questions, we'll take that under  
06:04:19 3 advisement. But we reserve the right to take the  
06:04:23 4 position that the deposition continues to be closed.

06:04:24 5 MR. HARVEY: Well, I disagree that the  
06:04:26 6 deposition is closed. From plaintiffs' perspective, the  
06:04:29 7 deposition will remain open pending the result of our  
06:04:31 8 motion to compel.

06:04:32 9 I understand you're reserving all your  
06:04:34 10 objections, but I want to make that clear for the  
06:04:34 11 record.

06:04:35 12 MR. RUBIN: Right. And we just are invoking  
06:04:37 13 the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that says seven  
06:04:39 14 hours. You're ending, I think, at 6.54, so....

06:04:41 15 You do have six more minutes, but, otherwise,  
06:04:43 16 the deposition is closed if you have no more questions.

06:04:47 17 MR. HARVEY: Again, I'll just reiterate that  
06:04:51 18 our position is that the deposition is not closed. I  
06:04:53 19 disagree with your characterization that a fixed seven  
06:04:58 20 hours would be the extent of what we would be entitled  
06:05:02 21 to on these facts and on these documents.

06:05:04 22 MR. RUBIN: Okay. Well, I think our letter  
06:05:06 23 exchanges speak to our respective positions, so....

06:05:09 24 With that, the deposition is closed from  
06:05:11 25 Google's perspective and thank you.

1                   I, Gina V. Carbone, Certified Shorthand  
2 Reporter licensed in the State of California, License  
3 No. 8249, hereby certify that the deponent was by me  
4 first duly sworn and the foregoing testimony was  
5 reported by me and was thereafter transcribed with  
6 computer-aided transcription; that the foregoing is a  
7 full, complete, and true record of said proceedings.

8                   I further certify that I am not of counsel or  
9 attorney for either of any of the parties in the  
10 foregoing proceeding and caption named or in any way  
11 interested in the outcome of the cause in said caption.

12                   The dismantling, unsealing, or unbinding of  
13 the original transcript will render the reporter's  
14 certificates null and void.

15                   In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my  
16 hand this day: February 1, 2013.

17                   \_\_\_\_\_ Reading and Signing was requested.

18                   \_\_\_\_\_ Reading and Signing was waived.

19                   \_\_\_\_X\_\_\_\_ Reading and signing was not requested.

20

21

22

23

\_\_\_\_\_  
GINA V. CARBONE

24

CSR 8249, RPR, CCRR

25

